

In reading them all I saw nothing new or unusual about you.

There is an FBI teletype of an ordered interview of Wade quoting him as saying that at that 1/24 session with the Commission about Oswald as an informant there was more speculation that he might have been a CIA informant.

There is also a 1/24/64 memo from Bertram in Houston to chief quoting Inspector Elliot Thacker as indicating belief the number was not S179 but was 110669 was believed by most news people to be that FBI number. That info. is probably of the day before because Bertrem refers to Thacker's call of 1/23.

It does not say where Thacker was and I recall no other such reference and no such story.

The CIA was so uptight about the passing reference Rankin made to it its "record copy" was stamped "For FOIA Review on. [sic] May 1976." It would be ^{of} "reviewed" for "disclosure" beginning ^{after} thirteen years! Without any classification claimed or legitimately subject to claim!

Not only that, there is no information in the Rankin memo that came from the CIA so it had no basis at all ~~for~~ for making any kind of claim to withhold it and the information in it!

That it did this does justify suspicion of the CIA.

This is because of a single sentence on page 3:

indent single space
Wade stated that he was also aware of an allegation ~~that~~ to the effect that Oswald was an informant for the CIA and carried Number 110669.

This numbering is consistent with CIA numbering. I have seen examples of it often on CIA records. *It is used instead of names on these records.*

Wade was correct in telling Warren and Rankin that the number attributed to the FBI was not as its informers are numbered for identification or as accounts are kept.

Hudkins told me that he had made the 172 and 179 number up to use on the phone in the belief that the FBI was ^ptaping his and other phones over this report. Hudkins also told me that not long after that was on ^{his} the phone he was visited by the FBI.

Before then Hudkins and my wife and I became friends and in an effort to learn more about this I primed a reporter ~~I~~ knew to question ~~H~~Hudkins about the entire matter, including the fake numbers. In the course of this ~~H~~Hudkins claimed not to remember the entire ^{exact} number but he did give that reporter the first four of those six numbers correctly.

Of all the people of whom I know only my two friends, Hudkins and Henry Wade indicated any knowledge of that number.

When I asked Wade about it, my recollection after so many years is that he said he had no recollection of his source. When I asked Hudkins he just refused to answer.

continuing friendly
Given out ~~friendly~~ relationship I interpret this to mean that Lonnie

will say nothing that might tend to identify his source.

On Wade's part ~~his~~ if he said he has no recollection, which may well be true, it can also mean that he ^{was} ~~is~~ unwilling to identify a confidential source.

If there is any other reference to this number in any Commission record of any form or nature I am not aware of it.

Rankin and the Commission dropped it after keeping this number secret.

There was no mention of it in that January 27 executive-session transcript, either. This means they did not even tell the other Members of the Commission about it!